(1) C.S.100/ 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR(C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO. 3170 **/2005**

PETITIONER

T.S. CHOUHAN, S/O. SHRI HAJARI LAL CHOUHAN, AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS, OCCUPATION-SERVICE, PRESENTLY POSTED AS TOWN INSPECTOR, P.S. KUANKONDA, DISTRICT DANTEWADA, BASTAR (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH, THROUGH ITS SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOME(POLICE), MANTRALAYA, D.K.S. BHAWAN, RAIPUR (CHHATTISGARH).
2. DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, POLICE HQ., RAIPUR (CHHATTISGARH)
3. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, POLICE HQ., RAIPUR (CHHATTISGARH).
4. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, BASTAR RANGE, JAGDALPUR (CHHATTISGARH).
5. SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, DISTRICT DANTEWADA, (CHHATTISGARH.)

P.R. No. 1961/05 Presented by Shri Aseem Dey dated 29.04.05

23/4/05

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION AND FOR OTHER SUITABLE WRIT OR WRITS, ORDER OR ORDERS, DIRECTION OR DIRECTIONS.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.3170..... सन् 2005

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	3.8.2005 Smt. Reema Dubey, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Akhil Agrawal, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents on advance copy. **I.A.No. 6191/2005** This an application for urgent hearing. The matter is taken up on board. This interim application stands disposed of. **W.P.No.3170/2005** Heard Smt. Reema Dubey, counsel for the petitioner and Shri Akhil Agrawal, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents on advance copy. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner, who is working on the post of Town Inspector of P.S. Kuankonda, District-Dantewada, has completed his 2 ½ years of service in the nexalites area and therefore, he is entitled to be transferred to an area of his own choice as per clause 7 of the SOP No. 1 dated 13.2.2001. A copy of the aforesaid SOP has also been filed as Annexure P-10. She submits that after completion of the aforesaid period as required by the SOP, the petitioner had made a representation to the concerned authority but, the concerned authority has not taken any decision on the representation of the petitioner and the petitioner is still working in the said area which according to the petitioner is a nexalites affected area. In the present situation, learned counsel for the	

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित – 2 –	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	petitioner submits that this petition may be disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to file a detailed representation before the concerned authority and the concerned authority may be directed to dispose of the representation of the petitioner within the stipulated period granted by this Court. This limited prayer, made by learned counsel for the petitioner is not opposed by the State counsel. Accordingly, the prayer is allowed. It is hereby directed that if so desired, the petitioner may file a fresh representation alongwith the certified copy of this writ petition and a copy of order passed by this Court before the concerned authority within a period of 3 weeks from today and if such a representation is filed, the concerned authority shall dispose of the same as early as possible preferably within a period of 2 months from the date of filing/receipt of the representation, keeping in mind the provisions referred to in SOP No.1 dated 13.2.2001. With the aforesaid observations, the petition stands finally disposed of. **Sd/-** **Sunil Kumar Sinha** **Judge**	
sunita		

(पीछे देखिये)